DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 364 HE 004 159

AUTHOR	Morishima, James K.; And Others
TITLE	Acceptability of Non-Traditional Grading: Views of College and University Admission Officers and Prospective Employers.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Office of Institutional Educational Research.
REPORT NO	IER-161-2
PUB DATE	12 Dec 72
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Performance; *Academic Records; *Admissions Counselors; Educational Innovation; *Employer Attitudes; Evaluation; *Grading; *Higher Education; Research; Research Projects

ABSTRACT

This detailed report presents the results of a study of the evaluation of traditional and several types of nontraditional grading systems. Questionnaires were distributed to a sample of admission and employment officers describing various grading systems. Responses were received from 44% of the graduate departments, from 76% of the undergraduate institutions, and from 20% of the employers. The respondents indicated the relative acceptability of the systems to their own institutions and organizations. In addition, information was obtained on the kinds of supplementary record desired, and on how academic records were handled. Results are recorded in tabular and discussion form. (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077364

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH*

December 27, 1972

IER-161-2

ACCEPTABILITY OF NON-TRADITIONAL GRADING: VIEWS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMISSION OFFICERS AND PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYERS

This detailed report presents the results of a study of the evaluation of traditional and several types of non-traditional grading systems. Questionnaires were distributed to a sample of admission and employment officers, describing various grading systems. The respondents indicated the relative acceptability of the systems to their own institutions and organizations. In addition, information was obtained on the kinds of supplementary record desired, and on how academic records were handled.

*James K. Morishima, Director
Judith Fiedler, Assistant Director
Carl M. Dickinson, Research Analyst

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCEDURE

As a preliminary step in the implementation of a Credit/No Credit grading option at the University of Washington in September, 1972, the student government and central administration planned to investigate the acceptability of student records containing pass/fail, credit/no credit, and other non-traditional grade entries. Inquiries were to be sent to undergraduate admission officers and graduate departments at institutions of higher education and prospective employers. The major intent was to present data to students on the acceptability of non-traditional grades.

A number of other state institutions arranged to participate in the study to obtain similar data for their own use. The contracting agencies in this joint venture were the Associated Students of the University of Washington (Student Government), Green River Community College, The Evergreen State College, The University of Washington, and Western Washington State College.

The University of Washington's Office of Institutional Educational Research was asked to assist in the design of a survey instrument, select a sample, administer the questionnaire, and prepare a final report based on analyses of the data. The questionnaire reflecting the concerns of the investigation was mailed at the end of December, 1971, to a sample consisting of the admission officers of 150 undergraduate and 1500 graduate departments at major universities, and of 700 organizations and businesses which employ large numbers of graduates of Washington's colleges and universities. The respondents were asked to rate the value of different types of grading systems for use in evaluation of candidates for their own purposes and to estimate the likelihood of admitting or employing candidates presenting such records from typical institutions of greater or less selectivity. The sample members were also asked what additional information they would require if the records presented were not considered adequate, and to describe their method of evaluating academic records.

Responses were received from 44% of the graduate departments, from 76% of the undergraduate institutions, and from 20% of the employers. In addition, a substantial number (105) provided supplementary or complete information

in letters or sent copies of prepared summaries of their policies. Data derived from this material have been included in the results reported below.

In the following sections, each question will be separately analyzed by Institutional (Colleges and Universities, Graduate and Undergraduate) and by Organizational (Employers) responses. Verbatim comments on the various items are appended in anecdotal form.

Characteristics of the responding institutions and organizations are as follows: Of the institutional responses, 72% were from graduate departments, 24% from undergraduate schools, and the remaining 4% represented professional or other schools. Among the responses from employing organizations, businesses made up 61%, while 39% were various public service agencies, such as school systems, social agencies, etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS

Item A. Traditional Grading

Table 1a presents the response to the relatively complex question of how the value of a grade record is determined for admission purposes. For each category of institution, ranked in order of selectivity according to the 1971 ACE published ratings (Astin, 1971), the acceptability of candidates who had earned various GPA's was assessed. (See enclosed questionnaire if more information is desired).

Among graduate institutions, as might be expected, a clear preference for high achieving candidates from prestige schools is seen. There is some evidence that even a high GPA from an innovative school is suspicious, since only 53% of the respondents indicate that these students would receive the highest priority in admissions.

TABLE 1a

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - TRADITIONAL GRADING

GPA by Category of Institution	Highest Admission Probability	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable, Does Not Meet Standards	Inadequate Information
Under 2.49				
Highly Selective	3%	10%	60%	27%
Less Selective	2%	6%	68%	24%
Innovative	1%	6%	66%	27%
2.50 - 2.99				
Highly Selective	8%	46%	20%	26%
Less Selective	3%	30%	37%	31%
Innovative	3%	28%	36%	34%
3.00 - 3.49				
Highly Selective	52%	36%	1%	12%
Less Selective	24%	52%	4%	20%
Innovative	20%	51%	4%	24%
3.50 - 4.00				
Highly Selective	84%	5%	0%	11%
Less Selective	61%	21%	1%	16%
Innovative	53%	24%	2%	21%

Those respondents who noted "inadequate information" in answer to any of the descriptions of grade acceptability were indicating they would require more data than the GPA alone provided. Part 1b of the table gives the answers to the question of what additional information would be necessary before a decision could be made.

TABLE 1b

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - TRADITIONAL GRADING

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	28%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	39%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	14%
D.	Written Statement by Students (Personal Interests, Experience, Etc.)	11%
E.	Interview with Applicant	8%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	13%
Senior Clerk	9%
Professional	71%
Other	7%

Policy Established on Traditional Grading

No	49%
No, Under Consideration	6%
Yes	45%

The respondents were also asked to answer two questions designed to demonstrate their institution's usual practice in handling applications. It is obvious, as will become clearer in later sections of this report, that many institutions do not have an established policy on evaluation of records, or at least do not distinguish between different components of the records which candidates present. This, of course, is very apparent in the responses to questions on how the submitted records are handled. The high degree of dependence on professional evaluation of records in graduate departments is probably related to the usual practice of having applicants evaluated by faculty members in that discipline.

While the questionnaire attempted to obtain descriptive material on types of admission policies, it was found that the responses to this question varied too widely to offer usable results.

Some schools and colleges apply a "Statute of Limitations" or forgiveness policy, whereby work done before a certain date or below a certain class level is not counted in the student's Grade Point Average. Respondents were asked to evaluate this type of record as well.

Slightly more than half of graduate admissions officers expressed willingness to accept credit of this type, but most seemed to prefer that it be in small to moderate amounts.

Table 2, below, shows the responses to this item.

TABLE 2

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

		Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	No Response	0%	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	29%	15%	23%	20%	2%	11%
Less Selective	29%	17%	27%	15%	2%	10%
Innovative	31%	21%	23%	15%	1%	9%

Item B. Evaluative Portfolio

Table 3 presents the results of the inquiry on the use of the Evaluative Portfolio. While this is by no means a common practice in higher education, it is being studied and experimented with in several institutions, and one of the sponsoring group for this study, The Evergreen State College, relies exclusively on this method for reporting its students' achievements.

The use of subjective evaluations rather than quantified scores on a student's transcript seems to have a negative effect on the rating of the acceptability of the student in all cases other than those originating in a highly selective institution. Students from other institutions have much lower chances of admission. Especially important is the finding that the Evaluative Portfolio is minimally acceptable from Innovative institutions, which are, of course, the most likely to make use of it.

Over one-third of the graduate institutions in the sample would require GRE or other test results as corroborating evidence of ability, with almost the same number requesting a transcript or record of courses taken or attempted. It is also true, however, that the GRE may be a requirement for all students, regardless of GPA.

While there seems to be reasonable acceptance of some credit from all types of originating schools at up to the 25% and to the 50% level, there is an inexplicable drop in the percentages who would accept from 51-75% of portfolio records. Above 76%, the acceptance level was somewhat better for such records from highly selective schools. In this case, 21% of the response is included in those who would accept 75% or more of the applicants record in the form of Evaluative Portfolio. As might be expected when records contain subjective material, a very large number of the respondents (86%) would require professional judgment on these applications. Seventy-seven percent of these institutions, however, have as yet no policy on this type of record.

TABLE 3

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - EVALUATIVE PORTFOLIO

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	26%	33%	6%	35%
Less Selective	8%	39%	11%	42%
Innovative	8%	35%	11%	46%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	35%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	15%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	35%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal Interests, Experience, Etc.)	5%
E.	Interview with Applicant	10%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	34%	20%	22%	3%	21%
Less Selective	38%	26%	21%	2%	13%
Innovative	42%	23%	18%	3%	14%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	2%
Senior Clerk	1%
Professional	86%
Other	11%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	77%
No, Under Consideration	8%
Yes	15%

TABLE 4

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - RANKED CR/NO CR OR RANKED P/F

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	42%	31%	4%	23%
Less Selective	14%	51%	6%	29%
Innovative	10%	47%	8%	35%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	29%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	37%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	19%
D.	Written Statement by Students (Personal Interests, Experience, Etc.)	8%
E.	Interview with Applicant	7%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	30%	22%	15%	3%	30%
Less Selective	32%	29%	12%	4%	23%
Innovative	36%	25%	13%	3%	23%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	6%
Senior Clerk	5%
Professional	81%
Other	9%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	75%
No, Under Consideration	9%
Yes	16%

Item C. Ranked Credit/No Credit or Ranked Pass/Fail

With regard to this type of academic record, a clear distinction again appears between the evaluation of students from the most highly selective schools, and those from other institutions. According to the admission officers who formed our respondents, over 40% of the students presenting records of ranked Credit/No Credit or ranked Pass/Fail from the most selective institutions would receive the highest priority in acceptance, while this number drops off sharply for applicants from other institutions. As is shown in Table 4, however, substantially more students would receive some favorable consideration on the presentation of an academic record of this description.

Somewhat surprisingly, approximately one-fourth of all respondents would accept more than 75% of an applicant's academic record in this form. This relatively high degree of acceptance probably is due to the common feeling that a grading system featuring ABC/No Credit, or High Honors, Honors, Pass/Fail does not differ in any significant way from traditional grading practices. In addition to the record, academic admission officers would rely on GRE and other tests (29%) and on letters of reference (37%).

Item D. Credit/No Credit or Pass/Fail

In contrast to the relatively favorable view of the previous system of grading, few respondents showed themselves willing to accept applicants who presented a record indicating only Credit/No Credit or Pass/Fail for courses taken. In Table 5 the results of this item are given. In no case did a majority report in favor of the method, regardless of the prestige of the originating school. Such a high degree of rejection throws additional emphasis on the types of additional or substitute information which the raters would require. Well over one-third would request letters of recommendation, a slightly smaller group (28%) would give weight to GRE or other examination scores. It should be noted that this description of grading specifies that failure to complete or pass a course would be reported on the student's record, so that the transcript would be evidence of unsuccessful as well as successful academic experience. Nineteen percent of the respondents indicated that they would require transcripts.

Respondents seem to be somewhat more willing to accept small amounts (under 25%) of this type of grading from less selective and innovative schools. This may represent acknowledgement that innovative and lower ranked colleges do utilize this type of grading for many of their students.

TABLE 5

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - CREDIT/NO CREDIT OR PASS/FAIL

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	13%	25%	11%	51%
Less Selective	5%	23%	17%	56%
Innovative	2%	20%	19%	59%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	28%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	39%
C.	Transcript (Course attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	19%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	7%
E.	Interview with Applicant	8%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	41%	28%	16%	2%	13%
Less Selective	43%	35%	11%	1%	10%
Innovative	48%	31%	10%	1%	10%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	6%
Senior Clerk	5%
Professional	80%
Other	9%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	77%
No, Under Consideration	9%
Yes	15%

TABLE 6

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - RANKED CREDIT/NO ENTRY OR RANKED PASS/NO ENTRY

Category of Originating Institution	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	19%	29%	10%	41%
Less Selective	7%	28%	17%	48%
Innovative	5%	25%	17%	54%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	27%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	39%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	19%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	6%
E.	Interview with Applicant	8%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	45%	22%	14%	1%	18%
Less Selective	48%	26%	10%	2%	14%
Innovative	52%	22%	9%	3%	14%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	6%
Senior Clerk	4%
Professional	81%
Other	8%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	79%
No, Under Consideration	8%
Yes	12%

Item E. Ranked Credit/No Entry or Ranked Pass/No Entry

An elaboration of the simple tally of courses successfully completed is described in this item. Students who pass or receive credit for the course are ranked in order of achievement; a merciful veil is drawn over the records of those who did not succeed. It is not a popular method of academic reporting to admission officers in our sample, with only candidates from the highest rated schools even approaching the 50% level of favorable consideration for acceptance. As Table 6 demonstrates, students presenting such records are regarded somewhat unfavorably, or at least are expected to produce substantiating materials to bolster their credentials. Recognition of the innovative nature of originating institutions merely lessens the acceptability of the method as a whole.

As was true in previous cases, the institutions in our sample tended to rely most on letters of recommendation for supplementary information.

Item F. Credit/No Entry or Pass/No Entry

As might have been anticipated, the least popular among the grading systems described was the last investigated, which provides the least precise measure of student's accomplishment. Presented by applicants from the innovative schools most likely to use this method, given academic records showing only Credit or Pass for the course, fewer than one-third were rated as even conditionally acceptable, even from the most highly ranked institutions. Applicants from lower ranked schools were proportionally rated. Table 7 presents the results on this item.

Applicants, apparently, might be accepted at about one-fourth of the responding schools with presentation of up to 25% of their academic record bearing entries of the Credit/No Entry type, but acceptance diminishes rapidly for larger proportions. Where substantiating evidence was required it tended to be in the form of letters of recommendation and test scores. Approximately 20% of the respondents indicate that they would require a transcript. However, since a characteristic of this grading system is the absence of record of failure or incomplete work, there is some question as to how useful a transcript would be for this purpose, or indeed to what it would be supplementary.

TABLE 7

GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - CREDIT/NO ENTRY OR PASS/NO ENTRY

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	11%	21%	15%	54%
Less Selective	5%	15%	24%	56%
Innovative	3%	13%	23%	60%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	27%
B.	Letter of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	38%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	19%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	7%
E.	Interview with Student	9%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	51%	25%	11%	2%	11%
Less Selective	57%	26%	7%	1%	9%
Innovative	61%	22%	7%	1%	9%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	6%
Senior Clerk	3%
Professional	82%
Other	8%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	80%
No, Under Consideration	8%
Yes	12%

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS

Item A. Traditional Grading

Among the admission officers of undergraduate institutions who responded to our questionnaire, respect for the qualifications of applicants from the most highly rated schools led to the expected approval of those showing GPA's above the minimal level (Table 8). It is interesting to note, however, that this approval does not extend to student records originating in innovative schools to the same degree as it does to those from other institutions. This finding is repeated in several of the tables which report reaction to other grading systems as well. Since many undergraduate students seek admission after completing varying amounts of work at two-year institutions, this category is considered separately in the following tables.

To some extent, transcripts are seen as preferable to other forms of supplementary evidence of qualification, closely followed by student interviews, examinations, and letters or similar evaluations. Oddly, considering the number chosing interviews, no respondent opted for a written statement by the prospective student.

TABLE 8

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - TRADITIONAL GRADING

GPA by Category of Originating Institution

Under 2.49	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	13%	29%	42%	15%
Less Selective	8%	26%	62%	4%
Innovative	8%	25%	50%	18%
Two-Year	13%	24%	47%	16%
2.50-2.99				
Highly Selective	19%	45%	17%	18%
Less Selective	14%	39%	39%	8%
Innovative	11%	32%	39%	18%
Two-Year	19%	26%	35%	20%
3.00-3.49				
Highly Selective	45%	40%	3%	12%
Less Selective	35%	55%	9%	2%
Innovative	24%	39%	9%	28%
Two-Year	28%	30%	22%	21%
3.50-4.00				
Highly Selective	71%	17%	2%	10%
Less Selective	60%	39%	0%	1%
Innovative	38%	38%	3%	21%
Two-Year	33%	35%	13%	19%

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

A.	GRE or Other Test	23%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	22%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	29%
D.	Written Statement by Student, (Personal interest, Experience, Etc.)	0%
E.	Interview with Applicant	26%

TABLE 8 (Continued)

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Originating School	No Response	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
		0%	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	22%	24%	13%	15%	3%	23%
Less Selective	22%	26%	21%	9%	3%	19%
Innovative	25%	32%	13%	9%	2%	19%
Two-Year	23%	40%	11%	7%	1%	18%

MEANS BY WHICH THIS TYPE OF GRADING RECORD IS HANDLED

Routine	18%
Senior Clerk	20%
Professional	46%
Other	16%

POLICY ESTABLISHED ON THIS TYPE OF RECORD

No	49%
No, Under Consideration	11%
Yes	40%

There appears to be a somewhat higher valuation of a large number of "Statute of Limitation" credits from highly selective institutions. For all types of institution, however, a lack of interest in accepting these credits is shown by the lack of response and the high percentages of complete rejection.

The routine nature of the process by which traditionally graded records are handled is undoubtedly related to the existence of a formal policy on this matter by 40% of the institutions surveyed. Nevertheless, the explicit restrictions on acceptable GPA's commonly noted as part of the admission requirements of state and other public institutions should lead one to expect that a larger percentage of the respondents would have cited such regulations.

TABLE 9

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - EVALUATIVE PORTFOLIO

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	22%	38%	6%	34%
Less Selective	13%	43%	12%	32%
Innovative	8%	35%	16%	41%
Two-Year	6%	26%	26%	42%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	28%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	20%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	10%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	0%
E.	Interview with Applicant	42%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	43%	16%	11%	3%	27%
Less Selective	44%	19%	13%	1%	23%
Innovative	52%	13%	13%	3%	19%
Two-Year	56%	14%	11%	1%	18%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	6%
Senior Clerk	8%
Professional	68%
Other	18%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	69%
No, Under Consideration	14%
Yes	18%

Item B. Evaluative Portfolio

Where evaluative portfolios are utilized, even highly rated institutions would have some difficulty in placing their students. As Table 9 indicates, barely one-fifth of such applicants would have the highest priority in admissions, with proportionately fewer students selected from less renowned schools. Again, it is noticeable that the innovative institutions most likely to rely on non-traditional forms of record are not therefore more likely to see their students accepted. Where the evaluative portfolio is viewed more favorably it tends to be approved for the major part of college courses. Here again, admission officers would rely more heavily on personal interviews than on other forms of additional information. Overall, approximately half showed no interest in this type of record, but some 27% expressed willingness to accept over 75% of their records in this form from highly selective institutions. They seemed less willing to accept such records from the other types of institutions.

In over two-thirds of the cases, evaluative portfolios would require professional-level review before acceptance.

Item C. Ranked Credit/No Credit or Ranked Pass/Fail

It can probably be assumed that selection among Ranked Credit/No Credit records is made on a basis very similar to that used for traditional grading systems. If this is true, Table 10 can be interpreted as indicating that attitudes toward ranked students are the same as those toward graded students. Despite this, substantial differences appear between responses shown here and on Table 8. For instance, students earning GPA's over 3.0 are seen as more likely to be acceptable from all categories of institutions, while this does not hold true for lower GPA's. The response when the grades are not explicit, however, would seem to indicate an assumption that ungraded students can be equated with those in the lower and middle ranks of students in the institutions using more conventional grading systems.

A student presenting over 75% of his credits in this form is somewhat more likely to be accepted than if he should present a like number of credits obtained under any of the other non-traditional grading forms. Personal interviews are weighted more heavily here than they are for students under more traditional systems, where additional information is required.

TABLE 10

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - RANKED CREDIT/NO CREDIT OR RANKED PASS/FAIL

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	27%	50%	4%	19%
Less Selective	18%	48%	6%	28%
Innovative	16%	44%	9%	31%
Two-Year	18%	31%	19%	32%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	24%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	22%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	15%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	0%
E.	Interview with Applicant	39%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	38%	13%	10%	4%	35%
Less Selective	38%	18%	13%	3%	28%
Innovative	44%	15%	12%	2%	27%
Two-Year	47%	19%	6%	1%	27%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	5%
Senior Clerk	24%
Professional	60%
Other	11%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	74%
No, Under Consideration	13%
Yes	14%

TABLE 11

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - CREDIT/NO CREDIT OR PASS/FAIL

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	18%	31%	12%	39%
Less Selective	12%	36%	14%	37%
Innovative	11%	34%	16%	39%
Two-Year	11%	22%	20%	47%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	30%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	10%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	9%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	0%
E.	Interview with Applicant	51%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	47%	18%	8%	1%	26%
Less Selective	50%	20%	7%	1%	22%
Innovative	54%	15%	8%	1%	22%
Two-Year	58%	17%	5%	0%	20%

Means by Which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	8%
Senior Clerk	16%
Professional	67%
Other	8%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	81%
No, Under Consideration	9%
Yes	10%

Item D. Credit/No Credit or Pass/Fail

The acceptance accorded students with Ranked Credit/No Credit records falls sharply when the ranking factor of such grades disappears. The results of questions on simple Credit/No Credit or Pass/Fail systems show that these are less desirable to admission officers in all cases (Table 11). Over half would now require a personal interview with the candidate, while nearly one-third would ask for additional tests or examinations for applicants.

Probably reflecting the rarity of Credit/No Credit schemes to date, an overwhelming number of institutions have as yet no policy for evaluating these, and other, non-traditional methods.

Item E. Ranked Credit/No Entry or Pass/No Entry

Deleting the notation of failure from academic records again lowers their acceptability on face value. As Table 12 shows, close to half of all such records would require supplemental support, in almost all cases in the form of a personal interview with the applicant. In this instance, as in the previous case for graduate admissions, there seems to be a clear understanding that the transcript would offer no valuable information beyond that given by the record offer per se.

Overall, nearly a quarter of the respondents would accept over 75% of applicants' credits in this form. The increased percentage of replies noting that policies are now being developed on the acceptability of grading systems of this type suggests that the responding institutions are aware of the need to adjust their procedures to projected modifications of the academic systems.

Item F. Credit/No Entry or Pass/No Entry

Questions concerned with attitudes toward the least precise of the grading systems under investigation found respondents least favorable. Fewer admission officers cited personal interviews with applicants as a means of adding to selection criteria, although this was still the most popular supplementary source. Table 13 gives the results of this section of the questionnaire.

Responses on the acceptable percentage of such credit indicate that this type of record is the least desirable of those studied. Somewhat more than one-quarter of the responding institutions have policies on this form of record; more than half do not, and are not in the process of obtaining them.

TABLE 12

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - RANKED CREDIT/NO ENTRY OR RANKED PASS/NO ENTRY

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	12%	24%	15%	49%
Less Selective	10%	30%	17%	44%
Innovative	5%	29%	17%	48%
Two-Year	14%	20%	21%	44%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	8%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	3%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	0%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	0%
E.	Interview with Applicant	89%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	54%	10%	7%	2%	27%
Less Selective	58%	11%	7%	1%	23%
Innovative	60%	9%	7%	2%	22%
Two-Year	63%	11%	3%	1%	22%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	13%
Senior Clerk	24%
Professional	46%
Other	17%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	66%
No, Under Consideration	26%
Yes	8%

TABLE 13

UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS - CREDIT/NO ENTRY OR PASS/NO ENTRY

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	12%	24%	22%	43%
Less Selective	7%	25%	27%	41%
Innovative	6%	27%	23%	44%
Two-Year	12%	20%	27%	41%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	20%
B.	Letter of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	17%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	20%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	0%
E.	Interview with Applicant	43%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	57%	11%	7%	2%	23%
Less Selective	60%	11%	8%	1%	20%
Innovative	61%	10%	8%	1%	20%
Two-Year	64%	13%	3%	0%	20%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	13%
Senior Clerk	12%
Professional	59%
Other	16%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	58%
No, Under Consideration	14%
Yes	28%

EMPLOYING ORGANIZATIONS

Item A. Traditional Grading

In responding to this question, organizations show themselves somewhat less dependent on GPA than do institutions, at levels below 2.49. Above 3.0 the results are highly similar for the two samples, although there appears to be a slight tendency for highly selective institutions to be more favorably rated by employers than by academic officers. Table 14 - Organizations, shows the ratings given to Traditional Grading records by these respondents.

Employers seem definitely more willing to accept limited amounts of Statute of Limitation credits from all types of schools than do their academic compeers. Evaluation of the records presented is reported as being done by professionals in over 80% of the cases, although it is very likely that these evaluators are professionals in the field of employment or personnel management rather than in the specific field of activity of the organization.

Compared to the situation at the institutions in the sample, an even larger majority of the organizations (77%) do not have an articulated policy on evaluation of this type of record.

Unlike academic institutions, employers demand few GRE or other tests as supplementary evidence of applicant ability. Instead, they show much greater reliance on the student's individual presentation of himself, through written statements of intention or interest, and interviews.

TABLE 14

ORGANIZATIONS - TRADITIONAL GRADING

GPA by
Originating Institution

Under 2.49	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	5%	37%	34%	24%
Less Selective	2%	29%	44%	25%
Innovative	1%	23%	45%	31%
Two-Year	2%	18%	56%	24%
2.50-2.99				
Highly Selective	13%	68%	8%	11%
Less Selective	6%	63%	19%	12%
Innovative	2%	44%	29%	26%
Two-Year	3%	35%	38%	24%
3.00-3.49				
Highly Selective	55%	34%	2%	9%
Less Selective	33%	57%	2%	9%
Innovative	20%	47%	12%	21%
Two-Year	14%	46%	23%	17%
3.50-4.00				
Highly Selective	66%	22%	1%	11%
Less Selective	57%	34%	0%	10%
Innovative	37%	34%	9%	20%
Two-Year	28%	33%	21%	18%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	4%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	26%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	26%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	21%
E.	Interview with Applicant	23%

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Statute of Limitations

Originating School	No Response	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
		0%	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	20%	12%	45%	7%	4%	12%
Less Selective	20%	15%	44%	8%	2%	11%
Innovative	22%	26%	35%	6%	1%	10%
Two-Year	28%	31%	27%	4%	0%	10%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	5%
Senior Clerk	7%
Professional	81%
Other	7%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	77%
No, Under Consideration	11%
Yes	12%

Item B. Evaluative Portfolio

As might be expected, employers are reluctant to rely on less usual forms of academic record. This was demonstrated in their responses to the questions on Evaluative Portfolios, as shown in Table 15.

Even from the most prestigious of schools, students whose achievement is indicated by this form of record would appear at some disadvantage in employment application. Nevertheless, they would appear to be more favorably regarded than those presenting low traditional grades. It is interesting to note that the supplementary information most often cited as necessary by these organizations is in the form of letters of reference or other subjective evaluations, which are highly similar to those typically found in the Evaluative Portfolio itself.

TABLE 15

ORGANIZATIONS - EVALUATIVE PORTFOLIO

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	29%	40%	9%	22%
Less Selective	18%	44%	10%	28%
Innovative	11%	40%	14%	35%
Two-Year	8%	29%	26%	37%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	4%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	26%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	26%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	21%
E.	Interview with Applicant	23%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	31%	23%	20%	8%	18%
Less Selective	33%	29%	19%	6%	13%
Innovative	39%	26%	18%	6%	11%
Two-Year	50%	22%	15%	4%	9%

Means by which this Type of Grading Policy is Handled

Routine	8%
Senior Clerk	2%
Professional	84%
Other	6%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	80%
No, Under Consideration	12%
Yes	8%

The low number of organizations having established policies on this type of record is probably an accurate representation of the rarity with which these are offered. On the other hand, they probably show some resemblance to the personal recommendations traditionally requested for employment applicants.

Item C. Ranked Credit/No Credit or Ranked Pass/Fail

A comparatively large number of respondents indicated that they would accept applicants presenting a record of Ranked Credit/No Credit grades, showing the similarity of a hierarchical ranking system to the more familiar number or letter grades. While approximately 50 to 60% of selection officers replied that they would give favorable consideration to such candidates, only from the highest rated schools did as many as one-third of the respondents fall into the highest priority group. Answers to the questions on this form of grading are shown in Table 16.

It should be noted, however, that a substantial percentage of respondents seem more favorably inclined to the inclusion of large amounts of work graded in this manner, with from 18% to 26% of the replies approving over 75% of college credit earned under this system. Again, the approval for this percentage is greater than that for smaller amounts of work graded in this way. This discrepancy, while it may reflect an acceptance of a mixed program in which old and new styles operate simultaneously, cannot be adequately explained at this time.

Item D. Credit/No Credit or Pass/Fail

Where the ranking factor is absent, as in the responses to questions on Credit/No Credit or Pass/Fail grading, willingness to accord high priority to applicants drops drastically even for students from high prestige institutions. As shown in Table 17 only 11% of such persons would be accepted, although the numbers of those in Category 2, "Consider favorably", remains relatively higher.

Differing from findings on the previous table, however, are the results of the question on the amount of such grading which would be accepted. For all instances in which more than 25% of courses are graded on a Credit/No Credit basis, acceptance is low. Again, the puzzling upsurge on records showing more than 75% appears, although weakly.

TABLE 16

ORGANIZATIONS - RANKED CREDIT/NO CREDIT OR RANKED PASS/FAIL

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	38%	47%	4%	11%
Less Selective	18%	64%	8%	11%
Innovative	11%	52%	17%	20%
Two-Year	8%	52%	25%	15%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	5%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	15%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	41%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	13%
E.	Interview with Applicant	26%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	29%	19%	17%	9%	26%
Less Selective	31%	23%	16%	9%	21%
Innovative	43%	20%	14%	3%	20%
Two-Year	52%	18%	9%	3%	18%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	7%
Senior Clerk	6%
Professional	82%
Other	5%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	82%
No, Under Consideration	9%
Yes	8%

TABLE 17

ORGANIZATIONS - CREDIT/NO CREDIT OR PASS/FAIL

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	11%	40%	19%	30%
Less Selective	5%	36%	27%	32%
Innovative	2%	30%	32%	36%
Two-Year	2%	28%	37%	33%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Tests	3%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	14%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	59%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	4%
E.	Interview with Student	20%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	41%	30%	14%	2%	13%
Less Selective	45%	30%	14%	3%	8%
Innovative	53%	28%	10%	1%	8%
Two-Year	58%	25%	8%	1%	8%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	8%
Senior Clerk	5%
Professional	82%
Other	5%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	84%
No, Under Consideration	7%
Yes	8%

Item E. Ranked Credit/No Entry or Ranked Pass/No Entry

Where students are ranked with regard to their accomplishments, but no record is maintained of unsuccessful attempts, employers tend to react negatively, as indicated in Table 18. Even here, however, respondents seem reluctant to base their judgments on the academic record alone. In this case, more respondents would require transcripts, although by definition these transcripts would not indicate failures or incomplete work. It is hard not to suspect that many respondents, among employers as in the academic groups, do not clearly understand the precise nature of the non-traditional forms under investigation.

Item F. Credit/No Entry or Pass/No Entry

Almost universally, employers would not give high priority to applicants with Credit/No Entry or Pass/No Entry records. As is demonstrated in Table 19, only those students from the highest rated institutions would have even a modest chance for selection under these conditions. Here again, selection officers would ask for transcripts as supplementary information. In many cases, however, employers would accept some small amount of Credit/No Entry grading, limited to below 25% of the total for most.

TABLE 18

ORGANIZATIONS - RANKED CREDIT/NO ENTRY OR RANKED PASS/NO ENTRY

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	12%	39%	18%	31%
Less Selective	2%	39%	26%	33%
Innovative	2%	29%	29%	40%
Two-Year	1%	23%	35%	41%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Test	3%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	23%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	41%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	7%
E.	Interview with Applicant	26%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	45%	25%	12%	6%	12%
Less Selective	47%	27%	13%	5%	8%
Innovative	55%	26%	11%	2%	6%
Two-Year	64%	22%	7%	1%	6%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	9%
Senior Clerk	6%
Professional	79%
Other	6%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	86%
No, Under Consideration	7%
Yes	7%

TABLE 19

ORGANIZATIONS - CREDIT/NO ENTRY OR PASS/NO ENTRY

Category of Originating Institution

	Highest Admission Priority	Considered Favorably	Unfavorable	Inadequate Information
Highly Selective	6%	29%	26%	39%
Less Selective	0%	27%	32%	41%
Innovative	1%	18%	39%	42%
Two-Year	0%	17%	38%	45%

Additional Information Required

A.	GRE or Other Tests	3%
B.	Letters of Recommendation, Evaluative Portfolio, Etc.	14%
C.	Transcript (Courses attempted, Comparative Class Standing, Etc.)	51%
D.	Written Statement by Student (Personal interests, Experience, Etc.)	7%
E.	Interview with Applicant	25%

Rate of Acceptance by Respondents

	Acceptable Amounts of Credit				
Originating School	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Highly Selective	42%	28%	9%	3%	8%
Less Selective	55%	28%	11%	1%	5%
Innovative	63%	23%	8%	1%	5%
Two-Year	69%	21%	6%	0%	4%

Means by which this Type of Grading Record is Handled

Routine	7%
Senior Clerk	6%
Professional	81%
Other	6%

Policy Established on this Type of Record

No	84%
No, Under Consideration	9%
Yes	7%

APPENDIX

Institutions - Supplementary Information

Eighty institutions and/or departments responded to the "Evaluation of Academic Record" Questionnaire through letters instead of, or in addition to completing the actual questionnaire. While there is no way of determining how clear the questionnaire was to the respondents, there is considerable indication in the letters received that a high degree of misunderstanding exists about the various forms of non-traditional grading. Consideration of the following material which deals with spontaneous comments and descriptions should bear this caveat. In particular, it was noticeable that in many cases where a grading form was rated as being not satisfactory, respondents mentioned that a required supplement would be a transcript, without regard for the fact that in some of these cases the transcript could present no new information. Similarly, there were cases of respondents requesting GPA's in situations where, by the nature of the grading system, these could not exist. Information contained in letters can first be broken down into five of the specific responses contained in question 1 of the questionnaire. These reflect the type of corroborative information the responding institutions requested from students applying to their institutions. Numbers in parenthesis indicate how often each was cited.

Test scores (GRE, LSAT, MAT,); (32)

Letters of recommendation, evaluative portfolio, etc.; (39)

Transcripts, GPA, class rank, etc.; (32)

Applicant's personal (or work) experience, background, letter of intent; (5)

Other - specifically itnerviews; (6)

In addition to these five categories, several institutions provided amplification of their positions concerning non-traditional grading practices versus traditional grading (alphabetical or numerical). Again, the numbers indicate the frequency with which these general attitudes were expressed.

For the P/F grades, much emphasis is placed on letters of evaluation and GRE score; (9)

A minimum GPA is generally required in the major area of study; (17)

The student with a P/F transcript is at a disadvantage when compared to one with grades on the transcript; (7)

A limited number of P/F grades accepted on a transcript, but not in the major area of study; (5)

A P/F academic record is inadequate; (4)

Evaluative portfolio is not adequate information; (2)

Difficult to evaluate P/F transcripts and the letters of recommendation often provide more mysticism than clarity concerning the applicant's abilities; (3)

Transcripts recording only "P" grades are not favored - it is necessary to see how a student performed in all classes he attempted; (1)

In contrast to these somewhat negative responses, several institutions felt that a non-traditional transcript would not necessarily be detrimental to the applicant. For example:

A person's application is evaluated as a whole placing no more emphasis on one specific piece of information than another; i.e.: grades over all else as an admissions criteria; (6)

If it is not possible to determine the required entrance GPA because of unconventional grading practices, the record receives special review; (2)

Traditional grades are preferred, but a P/F transcript is not detrimental; (1)

P/F grading does not matter - only the classes taken; (1)

Any type of academic record might be acceptable; (1)

Letters of recommendation are more important than grades; (1)

If more than 40% of a transcript is P/F, admission is based on test scores; if P/F grades are less than 40% of the transcript the courses are validated individually. An NP is considered an F; (1)

Because of low enrollment in the Graduate program, the institution would "bend over backwards" to offer admissions to "special students" who meet the criteria as far as can be judged on their completed work: (1)

However, one institution specifically stated that it would not be happy with a Credit/No Credit or Credit/No Entry transcript.

Four schools had specific policies regardless of the type of transcript. Two institutional departments stated that a specific talent or skill examination is required for admissions; i.e.; music, science. And two institutions stated that they may require a student to establish eligibility if he seems to be deficient in any field before granting regular admission.

Concerning the prestige or "selectivity" of an institution, twenty writers specifically responded to this aspect of the questionnaire. Ten respondents stated that the prestige of an institution does influence the admissions decision on P/F transcripts. An equal number, however, responded that the previous type of institution attended was not relevant for admission. In addition, two institutions replied that a previous school's "selectivity" was not the relevant point; the main concern was the previous institution's standard of grading. Furthermore, where knowledge of a school's standard is minimal, transcripts are not high on the criteria for admission; in this case, P/F or Credit/No Credit records do not make a great deal of difference. One last comment on the importance of an institution's "selectivity" was that the type of institution previously attended is indeed an indication of a person's ability to perform. For example, an outstanding record at Harvard would seem to indicate more talent than an outstanding record at Beadle State College.

Only sixteen institutions or departments mentioned by whom the academic evaluation for admission was completed. In fifteen schools, the records are evaluated by a professional or faculty committee; one institution utilizes clerical evaluation for admission record evaluation.

Several respondents felt that they were not qualified to give specific responses to the questionnaire:

> The specific department does not admit students per se; it only awards fellowships to those already admitted by the institution; (3)
>
> No firm policy for handling P/F transcripts; (5)
>
> The respondent was not qualified to provide any data for this survey and furthermore, an adequate, informative survey of this type is not possible; (1)

A final point for consideration mentioned by three respondents is whether the non-traditional record is for graduate or undergraduate work and whether admission is being sought for undergraduate or graduate level courses.

Organizations - Supplemental Information

Twenty organizations and five school districts responded to the "Evaluation of Academic Record" Questionnaire through letters rather than the specific items of the questionnaire.

Considering the organizations first, there was a consensus that grades, in most cases, were of secondary importance to other factors such as personality, personal enthusiasm, job stability and experience, and extra-curricular activities. Concerning the importance of grades, the responses were broken down into the following types of statement.

> Grades have little or no significance in hiring practices; (7)
>
> The importance of grades is dependent on the field within which the position occurs; i.e.; accounting or engineering firms require high grades in those specific areas, whereas a potential business man is hired on his ability to "sell himself"; (3)
>
> Academic grading fails to reveal personal traits of the individual; (2)

Two firms specifically stated that the applicant must have a better than average or a minimum (set by the company) GPA. And a government agency maintains the policy that without a GPA, an applicant is not eligible to be considered for a higher appointment grade, since one of the requirements for higher entrance grades is a minimum GPA.

Concerning the type of institution from which a candidate is applying two organizations stated that this was irrelevant. However, two other organizations stated that although "selectivity" of an institution was not important per se, the school must have a good reputation in the particular field to which the student was applying.

The organizations seemed to place primary importance on the personal

interview and personal traits rather than academic grades. Factors noted included:

Hires primarily on the basis of a personal interview; (2)

Job stability and work experience; (3)

Enthusiasm for the particular type of work; (1)

Financial means of education - whether the person was working to put himself through school, etc.; (2)

Extra curricular activities; (1)

A special circumstance was indicated by the school districts which responded to the questionnaire by letter. In general, they placed primary emphasis on student teaching or regular teaching expereince. Four of the districts felt that success in relating to the students was a more accurate predictor than grades. The fifth school district based its hiring on the criteria developed from the needs of a particular position. For example, if they needed a person to work on basic skills with children from a low-income area, they required someone with some inner-city living experience.

Finally, three organizations stated that they had had no experience with "ungraded procedures" and therefore had no policy. And a fourth company did not feel the questionnaire was applicable because all this company sought from an applicant was GPA and the number of years the person attended school.